Submitted on Tuesday, October 29, 2019

message type: Comment

Subject: Current proceeding before the Commission

First name\*: W.C. Last Name\*: Wilson address1: ADDRESS 1 address2: ADDRESS 2

city: CITY state: STATE zipcode\*: 93001

comments:

Re: Docket No. R2020-1



2019 DOT 30 P 1:33



As a person who regularly sends First-Class Mail via the United States Postal Service (USPS), I write to object to the Postal Service's apparent intent to once again assert that rates should be divisible by five. The notion that it is more convenient or that the public will find it easer to remember a rate is ludicrous on its face. I have purchased stamps for several decades and have successfully adjusted very quickly each and every time a rate increase took place. I can easily remember forty-seven or fifty-two, for example, just as easily as fifty-five or sixty. Millions and millions of other people have successfully coped for decades with changes in the price of postage stamps and the required rate to mail a letter.

The USPS assertion that the public will be better served with rates divisible by five was invented out of thin air to justify charging more than would be supported using standard benchmarks, such as inflation. If the Postal Service continues to insist that people find five to be so superior for purposes of calculation or memory, I suggest that the PRC demand to see the studies conducted by an independent research entity (such as a major research university) that support the claim.

Had inflation been utilized in determining the most recent rate increase, instead of the five-cent rounding fantasy, mailers such as myself most likely would have been paying on the order of fifty-two or perhaps fifty-three cents to mail a first-class letter. Would I prefer, instead, to pay fifty-five cents because the Postal Service concocted an absurd reason for setting that rate? Of course not, and I doubt very much that other people would prefer to pay more than is justified.

I urge to PRC to reject the Postal Service's five-cent rounding scheme.